

# REPORT OF NATIVE PAPERS

FOR THE

Week ending the 6th November 1897.

## CONTENTS:

	Page.		Page.
<b>I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.</b>		<b>(h)—General—</b>	
The frontier war ...	975	Mr. Stevens and the prayer of the Press Association ...	982
Sir George White on the "forward policy" ...	ib.	The Natu Brothers ...	ib.
		Mr. Stevens' reply to the Press Association ...	ib.
		The Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Press Association ...	ib.
<b>II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.</b>		The Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Press Association ...	983
<b>(a)—Police—</b>		The Buddha-Gaya Temple affair ...	985
Delay in trying Damodar Chapekar ...	ib.	The Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Press Association ...	986
The Goruckpore case ...	976	Supply of the Weekly Report on Native Papers to the <i>Englishman</i> ...	ib.
Theft in Maulvi Bazar ...	ib.	The Budh-Gaya affair ...	ib.
<b>(b)—Working of the Courts—</b>		<b>III.—LEGISLATIVE.</b>	
Mr. B. L. Gupta as Legal Remembrancer ...	ib.	The Criminal Procedure Bill ...	987
The Manager of the Chittagong Wards' Estates ...	ib.	The Criminal Procedure Bill ...	ib.
Babu Devi Prasad, Deputy Magistrate of Deoghur ...	977		
Some appointments in the Noakhali district ...	ib.	<b>IV.—NATIVE STATES.</b>	
<b>(c)—Jails—</b>		Nil	
The jail experiences of the editor of the <i>Hastavadi</i> ...	978	<b>V.—PROSPECTS OF THE CROPS AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.</b>	
A serious complaint against a warder of the Presidency Jail ...	980	Nil	
<b>(d)—Education—</b>		<b>VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.</b>	
Objectionable questions in the Upper Primary Examination ...	981	Tilak as a patriot ...	ib.
Objectionable questions in the Middle Vernacular Examination ...	ib.	The Anglo-Indian Press and the Indian Musalmans ...	988
<b>(e)—Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration—</b>		Pilgrimage to Hardwar ...	ib.
Nil.		Indian news in England ...	989
<b>(f)—Questions affecting the land—</b>		The <i>Englishman</i> on the Assam coolies ...	ib.
Nil.		Correspondents of Anglo-Indian papers ...	ib.
<b>(g)—Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation—</b>		The <i>Englishman</i> a true rebel ...	ib.
Increased railway accommodation for female pilgrims in the month of Kartik ...	ib.	The present condition of India ...	990
East Indian Railway Hospital ...	ib.	The <i>Englishman</i> snubbed ...	991
		Circulation of false rumours by Anglo-Indian writers ...	ib.
		<b>URIA PAPERS.</b>	
		Nil.	
		<b>ASSAM PAPER.</b>	
		Nil.	



## LIST OF NEWSPAPERS.

No.	Names of Newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.	REMARKS.
	<b>BENGALI.</b>	<b>CALCUTTA.</b>			
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Bangavasi" ...	Calcutta	20,000	30th October, 1897.	
2	"Basumati" ...	Ditto	.....	4th November, 1897.	
3	"Hitaishi" ...	Ditto	800		
4	"Hitavadi" ...	Ditto	About 4,000	29th October, 1897.	
5	"Mihir-o-Sudhakar" ...	Ditto	1,250	30th ditto.	
6	"Sahachar" ...	Ditto	About 500	27th ditto.	
7	"Samay" ...	Ditto	3,000	29th ditto.	
8	"Sanjivani" ...	Ditto	3,000	30th ditto.	
9	"Som Prakash" ...	Ditto	800		
10	"Sulabh Samachar" ...	Ditto	.....	30th ditto.	
	<i>Daily.</i>				
1	"Banga Vidya Prakashika" ...	Ditto	300	29th and 30th, October, and 1st November, 1897.	
2	"Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika." ...	Ditto	1,000	31st October, 1st, 2nd and 4th November, 1897.	
3	"Samvad Prabhakar" ...	Ditto	1,132	1st, 2nd and 5th November 1897.	
4	"Samvad Purnachandrodaya" ...	Ditto	200	29th, and 30th October, and 1st November, 1897.	
5	"Sulabh Dainik" ...	Ditto	Read by 3,000	30th October, and 1st and 2nd November 1897.	
	<b>HINDI.</b>				
	<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
1	"Marwari Gazette" ...	Ditto	.....		
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Bharat Mitra" ...	Ditto	2,000	28th October, 1897.	
2	"Hindi Bangavasi" ...	Ditto	10,000	1st November, 1897.	
	<b>PERSIAN.</b>				
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Hublul Mateen" ...	Ditto	500		
	<b>URDU.</b>				
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Al Kunz" ...	Ditto	.....		
2	"Darussaltanat and Urdu Guide." ...	Ditto	310	28th October 1897.	
3	"General and Gauhariyasi" ...	Ditto	330	31st ditto.	
	<i>Tri-weekly.</i>				
1	"Nusrat-ul-Islam" ...	Ditto	.....		
	<b>BENGALI.</b>	<b>BURDWAN DIVISION.</b>			
	<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
1	"Pallivasi" ...	Kalna	.....	31st ditto.	
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Bankura Darpan" ...	Bankura	500	1st November 1897.	
2	"Bankura Hitaishi" ...	Ditto	.....		
3	"Burdwan Sanjivani" ...	Burdwan	250		
4	"Chinsura Vartavaha" ...	Chinsura	620	24th and 31st October, 1897.	
5	"Education Gazette" ...	Hooghly	1,280	29th ditto.	
	<b>BENGALI.</b>	<b>PRESIDENCY DIVISION.</b>			
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Murshidabad Hitaishi" ...	Murshidabad	696	27th ditto.	
2	"Pratikar" ...	Ditto	603		



No.	Names of Newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.	REMARKS.
	<b>URIYA.</b> <i>Weekly.</i>	<b>ORISSA DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Sambalpur Hitaishini" ...	Bamra in the Central Provinces.	.....	.....	This paper is said to have some circulation in the Division, but the number of subscribers could not be ascertained.
2	"Samvad Vahika" ...	Balasore ...	190		
3	"Uriya and Navasamvad" ...	Ditto ...	309		
4	"Utkal Dipika" ...	Cuttack ...	480		
	<b>HINDI.</b> <i>Monthly.</i>	<b>PATNA DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Bihar Bandhu" ...	Bankipur ...	About 600	20th October, 1897.	
1	<i>Weekly.</i> "Aryavarta" ...	Dinapur ...	1,000	30th ditto.	
	<b>URDU.</b> <i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Akhbar-i-Al Punch" ...	Bankipur ...	500	29th ditto.	
2	"Gaya Punch" ...	Gaya ...	400		
3	"Tah Zeeb" ...	Patna ...	.....		
	<b>BENGALI.</b> <i>Fortnightly.</i>	<b>BHAGALPUR DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Gaur Varta" ...	Malda ...	.....	28th ditto.	
	<b>BENGALI.</b> <i>Weekly.</i>	<b>RAJSHAHI DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Hindu Ranjika" ...	Boalia, Rajshahi ...	243		This paper is not regularly published for want of type.
2	"Rangpur Dikprakash" ...	Kakina, Rangpur ...	180	.....	
	<b>HINDI.</b> <i>Monthly.</i>				
1	"Darjeeling Mission ke Masih Samachar Patrika." ...	Darjeeling ...	700		
	<b>BENGALI.</b> <i>Fortnightly.</i>	<b>DACCA DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Faridpur Hitaishini" ...	Faridpur ...	.....		
2	"Kasipur Nivasi" ...	Kasipur, Barisal ...	315		
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Barisal Hitaishi" ...	Barisal ...	.....		
2	"Charu Mihir" ...	Mymensingh ...	900	1st November, 1897.	
3	"Dacca Prakash" ...	Dacca ...	2,400		
4	"Sanjay" ...	Faridpur ...	.....	29th October, 1897.	
5	"Saraswat Patra" ...	Dacca ...	About 500		
	<b>ENGLISH AND BENGALI.</b> <i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Dacca Gazette" ...	Dacca ...	500		
	<b>BENGALI.</b> <i>Fortnightly.</i>	<b>CHITTAGONG DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Tripura Hitaishi" ...	Comilla ...	.....		
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Sansodhini" ...	Chittagong ...	120		
	<b>BENGALI.</b>	<b>ASSAM.</b>			
1	"Paridarshak-o-Srihattavasi" ...	Sylhet ...	.....		
2	"Silchar" ...	Silchar, Cachar ...	.....		







## I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.

THE *Sahachar* of the 27th October says that people expected that Sir William Lockhart's presence would soon bring the frontier troubles to an end. But in spite of

SAHACHAR,  
Oct. 27th, 1897.

The frontier war. the valour which is being exhibited by Sir William and his men, it will probably take the British Government some more time to gain a complete victory over the enemy. The uncivilised Afridis and other frontier tribes will, no doubt, this time be completely overthrown. But winter is at hand, and in winter Afghanistan and the frontiers become quite impassable. Unless, therefore, a victory is gained before winter sets in, the Government will have to suspend its operations and incur fresh expenditure in resuming them at its close. May God avert such a contingency. Considering the skill with which the tribes are fighting, it is clear that they mean to hold their ground to the last. The Government should therefore make adequate arrangements for finishing the war as soon as possible. Lord Elgin should give his best attention to this matter and forget Burma this year.

2. The *Hitavadi* of the 29th October has the following with reference to Sir George White's speech on the frontier policy:—

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

Sir George White on the "forward policy."

It is not with the object of extending its territories, observed Sir George White in a recent speech, or with any other similar object that the Government has undertaken this frontier war. The object of the Government is to educate and civilise the savage frontier tribes in our neighbourhood and to remove all impediments to their improvement. It is thus quite clear that Indian money is being spent for a just and pious cause. There would have been no cause for anxiety if the pious propensity of the Government had been satisfied with the achievement of the welfare of the Afridi and other frontier tribes, with their subjugation and disarmament. But the Afridis civilised and their race of progress once begun, who can say that we will not have to bear a burden of fresh taxation for the purpose of achieving the progress of the wild Afghans? When the pious intention of the Government has been once aroused for the achievement of military glory or the establishment of British name and reputation, it will not be satisfied with anything less than the disarmament of the Afghan people. There is no knowing whether after the Afghans have been civilised and their condition has been improved, the Government will turn its attention to the reformation of the uncivilised Russians and other kindred peoples. It may not be a matter of ingloriousness to the Government to promote the welfare of the Russians and other uncivilised tribes, but is it right to ignore the welfare of the Indian people and spend their money, as dear as blood, for the welfare and the reformation of the world?

It has been estimated that since the last Afghan war and up to 1896 Rs. 71,45,80,480, or in other words, about 71 crores and-a-half of rupees have been spent for the welfare of the frontier tribes. The Government has purchased glory and renown for the British nation and a stock of religious merit for the Indian people at the cost of this stupendous sum of money. The religious merit thus purchased for the Indian people is sure to clear their path to a lasting abode in heaven. It is our conviction, however, that if this money had been spent in educating the Indian people and removing their wants, this sudden desire, no doubt born of Russophobia, to promote the welfare of the frontier tribes would not have made its appearance. To cry in the wilderness is the only resource left to us, and as in duty bound we perform that duty.

## II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.

## (a)—Police.

3. The *Hitavadi* of the 29th October asks why the trial of Damodar Chapekar is being delayed. He has confessed his guilt before the Magistrate even in the absence of the police. Why then is his trial being delayed? Is it because the police is mortified that it has not been able to connect Tilak and the Natu brothers with the affair? Or will Damodar's trial never take

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

Delay in trying Damodar Chapekar.



place if the accomplices are not detected? Who will give satisfactory answers to these questions?

AL PUNCH,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

4. *Al Punch* of the 29th October says that the conduct of the Gorruckpore police in the North-Western Provinces is highly reprehensible in connection with the case in which

The Gorruckpore case. the widow of the late Maulvi Muhammad Kasim Khan and his young niece have been charged with having poisoned him. The police having heard of the murder of the Maulvi, proceeded to his house and brought his wife and his niece to the local thana, where they treated the two respectable ladies with great cruelty. The accused applied to the local Magistrate for a personal investigation, but the application was rejected. They then applied for an investigation by the police of some other place, but this prayer too was not granted. Nor was their prayer for the postponement of the enquiry, till the arrival of the Lieutenant Governor's order upon a memorial which had been submitted to him listened to. Application for bail was refused and the accused were not even allowed to have copies of the evidence given by witnesses before the police. The authorities should see that the accused get justice.

SANJIVANI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.

5. A correspondent of the *Sanjivani* of the 30th October complains of the prevalence of theft in the Maulvi Bazar sub-division of the Sylhet district in Assam. There is no town police. The chaukidars are generally paid Rs. 3 a month, but the town chaukidars are paid Rs. 5 a month on the consideration that they will keep a strict watch at night. They do not, however, do their duty properly, and there has been a prevalence of theft. The thieves have become so bold that they had lately the hardihood to commit the crime in the Subdivisional Officer's house. The local police has so far failed to trace a single theft or detect a single thief.

(b)—Working of the Courts.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

6. The *Hitavadi* of the 29th October says that every Bengali will be glad at the appointment of Mr. B. L. Gupta as Legal Remembrancer. It is a matter of rejoicing that the Anglo-Indians have not this time objected to this appointment from race-feeling, and Government has not from any weakness encouraged such objection. The writer prays that Mr. Gupta's claims may not be overlooked when the office is permanently filled up.

7. The same paper publishes the following charges against Rai Kailas Chandra Das, Bahadur, Manager of the Chittagong Wards' Estates:—

- (1) Whether he did not support the prayer of Babu Joges Chandra Roy, owner of the estate of Nayantara Chaudhurani, for permission to assume management of his estate.
- (2) Whether he did not subsequently send the Assistant Manager, Durgadas Babu, to Joges Babu to request him not to release his estate from the management of the Court of Wards.
- (3) Whether on Joges Babu's refusal to comply with that request, he did not object to Joges Babu's assuming charge of his estate on the ground of his unfitness to manage it; whether he did not stop collections in a hundred *mahals* in that estate and order their sale by auction; whether he did not stop Joges Babu's ward allowance, although drawing his own remuneration and that of his *amla* from the funds of the estate; whether his plea of not realising rent on account of distress is supported by the non-realisation of rent in other estates; whether any attempt was made to realise the arrears of rent due from those *mahals*, and whether "kuchcha" and "sumar" were prepared for the year in which the arrears fell due.
- (4) Whether when the estate first came under the Court's management, a list was prepared of its movable and immovable property and of its deeds; whether the Manager has not denied the existence of such a list; whether the list referred to by the Collector in his report No. 125 of the 21st April 1873, to the Commissioner still



exists, and whether those things alone are not being returned to Joges Babu which were purchased for the estate when it was under the Court's management, and whether bad things belonging to other estates are not being substituted for good.

- (5) Whether a carriage and a horse, which were purchased for Joges Babu in 1885, and were used by him only for two or three months, have not since been used by the Manager, and whether five or six thousand rupees of the estate's money have not been spent on their maintenance since their purchase.

The writer corrects a mistake in his former article against the Manager. This estate did not possess Government promissory notes worth Rs. 11,000 when it first came under the Court's management. Promissory notes to that amount were purchased for the estate during the time it was under the Court's management, and this amount was applied to the liquidation of the debts of the estate at the time of its restoration to its owner.

8. The same paper learns from a correspondent that Babu Devi Prasad, Deputy Magistrate of Deoghur, is in the habit of showing undue favour to the strong. Babulal Jha, Receiver of the Vaidyanath temple, made petitions to the Subdivisional Officer of Deoghur on the 3rd and 5th July last, stating that Babu Mokshadananda Jha had on two days come personally to take what was due to him of the offerings at the shrine instead of sending his servant for it as usual, that he had been opposed by the servants of the temple and that a breach of the peace was imminent. The Subdivisional Officer made over the case to Babu Devi Prasad. The Deputy Magistrate was in a dilemma. There was on one side a poor person, Mokshada Babu, praying for justice, and on the other the powerful Mohant of Vaidyanath. He, therefore, did not consider that there could be no harm in Mokshada Babu's himself taking his dues instead of sending his servant for them, and made him furnish a bail of Rs. 200 for keeping the peace.

The writer will make no remarks on Babu Devi Prasad's judicial acumen, for all men are liable to error. But the way in which he has tried the case is most strange, arbitrary and illegal. Babulal Jha was the complainant in the case, and the Deputy Magistrate called upon him and the accused to attend with evidence, and at the same time ordered that a notice should be issued to the mohant. There is no record, however, in the file of the case of the service of a notice upon the mohant. The mohant, nevertheless, filed a list of witnesses as a complainant in the case. There is no record however in the file of the submission of any petition by him. The mohant is a big folk, and he could, therefore, appear as a complainant without having received a notice and submitted a petition.

Devi Babu's subsequent proceedings are still more strange. He adjudged Mokshada Babu guilty on the sole evidence of the mohant's witnesses. The order calling upon the Receiver of the temple to attend with witnesses was not enforced. The original and principal complainant in the case was not thus required to file a list of his witnesses, and the case was disposed of without an examination of those witnesses. After the mohant had closed his evidence and the evidence on the accused's side had been partly taken, Devi Babu took fresh evidence on the side of the mohant in disregard of the protest of the other party. The correspondent has sent copies of the papers of the case to substantiate his charges against Babu Devi Prasad. The Deputy Magistrate shows such undue favour to the rich and the powerful in many cases. Here is another illustration. There is a bull consecrated to the God Vaidyanath, which does a good deal of mischief, being at large. A proposal was made that the bull should be penned. But the question arose who would bear the cost of its feeding. The residents of Deoghur contended that the mohant should pay for its maintenance, as he is bound to maintain all animals consecrated to the god. The mohant, however, refused to bear the expense. The Deputy Magistrate therefore decided that the residents should feed the animal by raising subscriptions among themselves.

9. A correspondent of the *Mihir-o-Sudhakar* of the 30th October complains that under Mr. Agasti, the temporary posts of *amins*, *amin's muharrirs* and attestation *muharrirs*, which are created every year in winter in the

Some appointments in the Noakhali district.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

MIHIR-O-SUDHAKAR,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.



Noakhali district, are filled by men taken from other districts, in disregard of the claims of Noakhali men. The claims of Musalmans are particularly overlooked, though they form 75 per cent. of the population of the district. Lately eight men were taken for these posts, of whom only one was a Musalman, all the rest being Hindus, and only the Musalman and one among the seven Hindus are men of the district. No advertisement calling in applications for the posts was published in the district.

## (c)—Jails.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

10. The editor of the *Hitavadi* continues the narrative of his jail experiences in his issue of the 29th October:—

The jail experiences of the editor of the *Hitavadi*.

Not a syllable of what we have said about punishments is untrue or overcoloured. I have myself witnessed many innocent prisoners punished on the strength of the statement of a durwan or a convict officer. It is not in the nature of the authorities to take evidence in a regular way or to make a regular investigation. The judge of jail offences tries them under the influence of a haphazard impression. Convict officers accuse other convicts from a desire of gaining marks, from a hope of bettering their own condition, from a wish to save themselves, or from malice. They are sometimes punished for not accusing other prisoners. Many of them have therefore to be unnecessarily harsh towards other prisoners from a fear of punishment.

A Changma prisoner, named Pringking has become a convict warder. At the time of writing out his ticket, we one day found that he was once put in fetters for not reporting against prisoners. The punishment is recorded in the Register of Punishments.

"Very little use in file, never reports a prisoner. Fetters until he shows agility. 14th April 1892."

The number of this punishment in the permanent register is 1,393. Now judge whether convict officers can, if so dealt with, have the courage not to commit oppression. Again, the least remissness in salaaming is punished. The convict officers have, therefore, no choice but to be harsh. Will the reader hear one incident in connection with salaaming?

A convict overseer named Ahmed Hossein (5084A), who has since become a convict warder, was employed in counting the prisoners in a file and failed to notice when the Civil Surgeon passed by, and did not therefore bid the prisoners under him to salaam that officer. He therefore lost 144 marks, that is to say, his period of imprisonment increased by six days. This will be found under item No. 145 in the Register of Punishments.

"Not calling his prisoners' attention whilst Medical Officer was passing. Cut 144 marks."

These punishments may however be pardoned, but punishment of prisoners for easing themselves is quite unpardonable. It is a matter of rejoicing that punishment for this offence has now been abolished. We have spoken before of prisoners easing themselves on their dining plate. We found in the Jailer's Report Book that formerly prisoners were not allowed to ease themselves after the evening meal. The sufferings of the prisoners have been considerably mitigated since the day when a concession was made to them on this point. (*Vide* Jailer's Report 16th March 1891, pages 83 to 85.)

"There has been a marked decrease in the falling off of the number of prisoners taken to hospital since the prisoners have been allowed to latrine after meals. There are, however, a few who ease themselves either in their *batties* or *gamchas*. D. O'Connell."

It is a matter of rejoicing that these infernal torments are at an end, since arrangements were made for prisoners easing themselves in the dormitory itself.

Be that as it may, we will not dwell further upon the subject. In order to show what punishments have been inflicted for what offences we will give a few illustrations and with them conclude our remarks on the subject.

"20th January 1897. Made a tail for another prisoner by tying a rope on the back of his jacket. Fetters for two weeks.

Idleness.—Fetters for one week.

Did not eat his meal.—Fetters for one week.



Habitually under-works.—Handcuff in an erect posture for one week.

Disobeys orders.—Handcuff for four nights.

Had in his possession three letters addressed to his friends for money.

—Solitary confinement and strict watch for six months.

Working together with the prisoner who had a tail of rope made for him.

Cut 144 marks (that is to say, his period of imprisonment increased by six days.)

22nd January.—Had a little castor oil by him—hand-mill for three months.

Had an excess jacket with him and pushed the convict overseer—*chati* for two weeks.

23rd January.—Making noise, hand-cuff for four nights.

27th January.—Quarrel and affray, *danda* fetters for three months and to grind wheat in the hand-mill in his cell.

29th January.—Tobacco—*chati* for one month.

30th January.—Tobacco—fetters for one month.

1st February.—Tobacco—penal diet till release.

2nd February.—Continued under-work—20 stripes.

10th March.—Tobacco—fetters for two weeks and shave his head and beard.

Suffered the beard of a prisoner under him to grow too long—shave his head and moustaches."

What has been said about punishments will probably give a sufficient idea of how offences are punished. We will therefore conclude here our remarks on the subject and proceed to relate the incidents of our own imprisonment.

On the 29th January I began to work as a clerk. On the afternoon of that day a visitor of the jail, Mr. R. D. Mehta, and another friend of mine came to see me. On the 30th January, too, several of my friends and my attorney came to see me. On the 31st January, too, several of my friends came with my son to see me. These facts are not recorded on my ticket.

I should have been weighed on the 31st. But no one weighed me. Only my ticket was taken and it was written thereon:—"Same weight—174 lbs." On the first day of February two pleader friends of mine came to see me. That day letters and telegrams which had been sent to my address were delivered to me. It was recorded on the ticket.

"Give him his letters by order."

We cannot describe the joy we felt on reading that mass of letters and telegrams. We wished to write some letters that day, but were informed that an ordinary prisoner can write one letter and receive letters only at intervals of three months. The rule about visits too was the same—once in three months. It was by a special favour that I was allowed to see friends. I further learnt that day that a letter written by a prisoner must not exceed 12 lines of a ruled form. I was astonished to hear of this terrible rule. I heard that the prisoners owed this privilege of writing 12 lines to the recommendation of Mr. R. D. Mehta and the Hon'ble Jay Govinda Law. They were allowed to write not more than six lines only two years ago.

Mr. R. D. Mehta wrote on 6th June 1895 :—

"One prisoner said that he was not allowed to write to his people a letter containing more lines than six. I learnt from Mr. Barrett that such is actually the rule of the jail. Could not this be modified, and another half a dozen lines more be permitted?"

On the 23rd August last the Hon'ble Jay Govinda Law recorded remarks in the Visitors' Minute Book about prisoners' letters being confined to six lines. In consequence of these remarks Mr. Mehta's recommendation was accepted. I for myself was greatly surprised to learn that a prisoner's letter must not exceed 12 lines.

It may be asked why the prisoners do not inform the visitors of their grievances. The answer is that, as a rule, visitors do not make enquiries of their own accord, and as they are accompanied by jail officers, prisoners do not venture from fear of punishment and oppression, to freely speak out their minds. They cannot also know when the visitors come and go. I have not seen any visitor except Maulvi Ahmed enquiring about any matter. I will refer to this matter in speaking of visitors.



Besides, complaints do not always do much good. When on a visit to the jail, Sir John Lambert once referred to the complaints of the prisoners. The Superintendent of the Jail replied that so many complaints were made because the editor of a popular native paper and the Secretary of a Society had lately visited the jail. We will give a short extract from the Minute Book:—

28th February 1894.—As regards these complaints generally, the habituals have lately been in a state of unrest, which can only be attributed to the visit of a popular native paper, and the Secretary of a Society. Any changes following such visits are likely to be attributed, however falsely, to this cause."

It is thus in a manner hinted that any reform made after the visit of the editor of a native paper will injure the prestige of Government. It will be easily seen how idle it must be on the part of the prisoners to ask for reforms or for an alleviation of their sufferings. The reader must accept our observations with caution, for we were once closely connected with the paper and the society.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

11. The same paper says that Mr. Allen, a warder of the Presidency Jail,

A serious complaint against a warder of the Presidency Jail.

has been accused of a grave offence, namely, that of illegally releasing a civil prisoner. The facts of the case are given in the following extract from

page 150 *et seq.*, of the Superintendent's report book, under date 2nd March:—

"A Mr. E. Lehmann presented himself before me this afternoon, asking why his judgment debtor, Tincowry Coondoo, had been released yesterday morning. He handed me a receipt drawn up on a sheet of note paper for Rs. 15-8 on account of diet money for this civil prisoner. It is dated 27th February, and is signed by gate warder Allen. I called for the Civil Prisoners' diet money receipt book and the cash book; in neither of those registers is any entry that the money had been paid.

The Jailor explained that he brings up for release all civil prisoners for failure of diet money on the morning of the first of each month, after referring to these books. The prisoner was accordingly presented to me yesterday morning, and having satisfied myself that the release was in order he was released.

Mr. Allen acknowledges the receipt of the money and the granting of the receipt on a slip of paper, and says in defence that the matter slipped his memory, and hence his omission to enter it either in the diet money receipt book or the cash-book. As far as this goes, the matter is explainable, but unfortunately there is another aspect of the case which came out during the investigation.

It appears that the judgment creditor heard yesterday of the debtor's release and came to the jail at 5 P.M. He saw Mr. Allen who acknowledged the mistake and said he would re-arrest him or words to that effect. But having thus his memory refreshed he told no one of his mistake. I was in the jail between 5 and 6 P.M., and heard nothing of it. Neither did the Jailor who was also in the jail. This morning again I was present all the morning and it was not until Mr. Lehmann called this afternoon that the matter came out. Mr. Allen says he was trying to recover the man, and hence did not mention it and in explanation of his finding himself in possession of Rs. 15-8 over and above Rs. 156 the cash he had accounted for on the 27th ultimo, says that the money lay in the office drawer, and he thought it was his private property. Okhil Babu in charge of the releases said he asked Mr. Allen before presenting the prisoner for release if the diet money had been paid, and was informed by Mr. Allen that it had not been paid.

I have no wish to impute any dishonest motive in this transaction to Mr. Allen; indeed, I believe him to be an honest man. But he could not have taken a more effectual mode of damaging his character than he has done."

This account of the case naturally suggests the following questions:—

- (1) Why did Mr. Allen grant a receipt on a slip of paper instead of on the printed receipt form?
- (2) Why did he not keep the money with the office deposits?
- (3) Is it possible that he should not remember the fact of the deposit, even when Akhil Babu asked him whether the prisoner's diet-money had been deposited?



(4) When he remembered the fact of the deposit which was on the day Mr. Lehmann made a clamour, why did he not deposit the money?

(5) Is it possible that a European who draws a pay of only 100 rupees per month and must, therefore, be hard pinched should leave 15 or 16 rupees of his own money in a drawer for several days and not remember the circumstance?

(6) What efforts did he make for the re-arrest of the prisoner, and under what law would he be justified in re-arresting him? These questions do not admit of satisfactory answers, and yet the Superintendent writes:—

“His plea that he wanted to re-arrest the man and then tell us, as he was in fear of the consequences, is probably the correct one.”

The writer considers Mr. Allen's plea false and impossible. It is not possible that an old jail-officer like him should not know that re-arrest would be illegal. It is possible for Mr. Allen to get off scot-free on account of the solicitations of his family and his patrons, but he is guilty of a serious offence under the Penal Code. He has been reinstated in his post only after a few days' suspension.

Mr. Stevens is requested to personally enquire into the matter.

(d)—Education.

12. A correspondent of the *Hitavadi* of the 29th October complains that the questions on *Patiganit* and *Subhankari* in the Upper Primary Examination of this year in the Presidency Circle were much too hard, harder indeed than those set in the paper on that subject for the Middle Vernacular Examination. It was not indicated in the Upper Primary paper, as in the Middle Vernacular one, which of the questions should be answered according to the rules of *Subhankari*.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

13. Another correspondent of the same paper, who is the Head Pandit of a school, complains that the setter of the paper on *Patiganit* and *Subhankari* in the Middle Vernacular Examination of this year went against the Director's circular in allotting 102 marks to *Patiganit* and 48 to *Subhankari*, and by setting the fourth question on *Patiganit*, which cannot be answered with the help of any proposition in the first book of Euclid.

HITAVADI.

The words “ত্রিভুজের যে দুই কোণ দুই লও” in question I on Geometry and Mensuration are unintelligible. The candidates are asked in the same question to name the converse proposition, but the correspondent cannot determine what proposition is meant.

(g)—Railways and communications including canals and irrigation.

14. A correspondent of the *Hitavadi* of the 29th October complains that on the 19th October last the Burdwan station was overcrowded with pilgrims, mostly females, but he found only one female carriage and that full in each of the two up Delhi passenger trains which reached the station at 8 P.M. and 2 A.M. respectively. Many females had therefore to get into male carriages. As this month of Kartik is a month of pilgrimage with Hindus, the Railway Company should attach more female carriages to their trains during this month.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

15. A correspondent of the *Sanjivani* of the 30th October complains that East Indian Railway hospitals are not well stocked with medicines and drugs. The railway hospitals are maintained solely for the benefit of the poor clerks and their families, but they are often compelled to provide themselves with medicines and drugs and pay for them out of their own slender means. The railway authorities inspect the hospitals from time to time, but they seem to be very niggardly as regards the stocks of medicine. The Hospital Assistants are always in want of medicine, but are never supplied with adequate supplies. It is to be hoped that the attention of the railway authorities will be drawn to the grievance of their poor clerks.

SANJIVANI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.



(h)—General.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

16. The *Hitavadi* of the 29th October writes as follows:—

Mr. Stevens and the prayer of  
the Press Association.

Although we cannot agree with Mr. Stevens' decision in regard to the prayer of the Press Association, we cannot but express our gratitude to him for the generous and sympathetic manner in which he has expressed his views. The people of Bengal feel indescribable satisfaction at the fact that the Officiating Lieutenant-Governor still sticks to that opinion about the native press which he held before he was raised to his present dignity. His Honour says that a native paper which constantly dwells upon the happiness and prosperity under British rule and constantly extols the ability and individual merits of the officials, finds favour neither with the European nor with the native community. It is a matter of regret that everybody does not think like His Honour.

There can be no doubt that His Honour has entitled himself to our gratitude by delivering these instructions. We believe that no sensible man will differ from him on this point. We will now consider the grounds on which the sympathetic Lieutenant-Governor has rejected the prayer of the Press Association that a native paper which is found to write in an objectionable manner should be first warned through the Association and then prosecuted if it is not found to mend its ways.

His Honour fails to see why a distinction should be made, in this respect, between sedition and other offences under the Penal Code. The reason why the Association prays for the concession is that it has an impression that no editor in this country is really an enemy of the Government. Not that an editor cannot be made out a rebel in the eye of the law by a tortuous use of words and in consequence of the disposition of the Judge. But, as a matter of fact, no editor desires the subversion of a rule under which they have obtained liberty of speech and expect to obtain greater powers. Those who are charged with sedition may be guilty of error or indiscretion, of offences unwittingly done, but they are never really guilty of sedition. His Honour is right in saying that Government will incur great odium if it prosecutes any paper for sedition against the wishes of the Association. But there will be little chance of any difference of opinion between the Government and the Association if they calmly discuss together the merits of each particular case.

The Lieutenant-Governor throws out the hint that the members of the Association should learn to act in concert. But if every member realises that he will incur the displeasure of Government as well as of the majority of newspapers by not acting according to the wishes of the Association, there will be little likelihood of his acting otherwise.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Stevens will not remain Lieutenant-Governor much longer or he would, we hope, grant the Association's prayer on a reconsideration of the matter.

HITAVADI.

17. The same paper says that the Natu brothers have lost their mother. Sita Bai has probably died of a broken heart on account of the sudden banishment of her two sons.

The Natu brothers.

The dignity of the authorities will not suffer, if they release the Natu brothers in consideration of the onerous religious duties which lie upon a Hindu's son on the death of a parent. There has been a climax of arbitrariness, and sticking to it any longer will not look well.

SANJAY,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

18. The *Sanjay* of the 29th October is thankful to the Lieutenant-Governor for the very proper advice he has given to the native press in his reply to the memorial of the Press Association. Such an experienced and affectionate ruler compels everybody's respect and reverence.

Mr. Stevens' reply to the Press  
Association.

SAMAY,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

19. The *Samay* of the 29th October has the following:—

The Lieutenant-Governor's  
reply to the Press Association.

Unreasonableness is not a defect of the Government's reply to the memorial of the Press Association. Had the subject-matter of the controversy been as plain and easy as we considered it to be, lengthy remarks and comments would have been superfluous. But the present aspect of things has given rise to a misgiving. We are induced to think that we have yet many things more to learn. The current of circumstances seems to be so much



against us that if we make a faultless statue of Rama and send it out to the world, it will at once turn into a statue of black-faced Hanuman. The present current of events threw the press into a panic, and that is the reason why the Press Association appealed to the Government for its favour. The plague in the Bombay Presidency threw the Bombay public into great excitement. Two English officials were murdered. Had these mournful incidents not taken place, the Tilak case would not have been instituted, and it is only superfluous to say that Mr. Tilak would not have been punished for the writings in the *Kesari*. In his charge to the jury the Judge repeatedly asked them to take the prevailing circumstances into their consideration. Damodar Chapekar, the man who has confessed to the murders, does not say that he was well acquainted with Mr. Tilak. We are, of course, told that he has been an ardent reader of the *Kesari*. Now, if editors of newspapers are to be punished for crimes committed by their ardent readers, even the Anglo-Indian papers will not escape punishment. To take an instance, O'Hara was no doubt a reader of some Anglo-Indian paper or other, and of the hundreds of articles published in that paper one might have been of an exciting nature.

It is our impression that members of the Press Association have not yet been able to understand what it is that makes an article seditious. This is why they asked the Government to forgive a newspaper its first offence. The Government might have refrained from rejecting their application wholesale. It would have done a great good to the country if it had at least assured the Association that in the case of a trifling offence the offending journal would be handed over to that body for warning and correction. No one questions the right of the Government to determine whether the writings of a paper should or should not be the subject of a prosecution; but in the opinion of the wise press prosecutions do not reflect credit on the Government or its representatives. This being the case, the less are such undesirable prosecutions undertaken the better. If mild measures serve your purpose, what is the necessity of resorting to severe measures? The Lieutenant-Governor is, so to speak, the life and soul of the body politic. We, his subjects, are its limbs and component parts. We shall be guided as he will guide us; we shall work as he will set us to work. The health of the body depends upon its vital principle and disease is the consequence of a violation of the law governing it.

The Lieutenant-Governor fears that the decision of the Press Association might not be unanimously accepted. We do not think that His Honour is correct in this surmise. The newspapers may differ in many things, but not in the matter in question. The Lieutenant-Governor further observes that all the newspapers have not joined the Association. This is true. But even those that have not joined are not likely to differ from the Association in their opinion on the subject under notice.

20. The *Bangavasi* of the 30th October has the following on the Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Press Association:—

The Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Press Association.

Mr. Stevens, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, has rejected the memorial of the Press Association on five grounds. We are agreeably surprised at his sincerity. Any other ruler in his position would have silenced us with the first of the five arguments which has reference to the temporary nature of his office, and would not have been open-hearted enough to state the remaining four. But Mr. Stevens has been plain-spoken and we cannot but be grateful to him for this. To tell the truth, we expected the reply which he has given to the Press Association, and we knew that our prayer, preposterous as it was, was not likely to be granted. But so enticing was hope and the assurance given by other people proved so strong that we approached the Government with our prayer. But now when we think of our position, we are almost led to mournfully cry out—"Tell us, O Mother Tara, where we shall stand!"

The interpretation which Mr. Justice Strachey, following in the wake of Chief Justice Petheram, has given of the word "disaffection," the manner in which he has defined the word "disapprobation," the construction which he has put upon section 124A make it almost impossible for us to write or say anything. When we say or write anything we feel groping in the dark. We always write in fear, and the *Pioneer* and the *Englishman* are incessantly barking at us from behind the British lion. They are always busy picking holes

BANGAVASI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.



in our writings and urging the Government to take severe measures with us—to slay us, so to speak, on a bed of ashes. Friendly counsel and advice are not in their line. It is far from their intention to correct our mistakes in a friendly manner. Their style is expressive of nothing but spiteful sarcasm and vituperation. Over and above this, comes the reply of the Government in which it is plainly stated that there may be cases in which a newspaper may have to be, instead of being served with a warning, at once prosecuted for sedition. It must, of course, be admitted that the Lieutenant-Governor's reply is given in a courteous style, and that we need fear nothing so long as he is our Lieutenant-Governor. But this happy state of things will not continue long.

In his letter to the Press Association the Lieutenant-Governor has given us sound advice. But the question is, have we the ability to act up to this advice and, even if we have that ability, will it not be going against the current of circumstances to act up to it? In our opinion, we have not the ability to act up to the Lieutenant-Governor's advice, and time and circumstances are against our acting up to it. This being the case, and we being a subject people, we ought by all means to refrain from attempting a task which it is not in our power to perform.

Let us explain what we mean. A free and proper criticism becomes impossible when we no longer feel ourselves in close relationship with those whom we have to criticise—when, in fact, we cannot look upon them as our own. Under such circumstances, our criticism is most likely to be lost upon those whom we criticise. The English education which the European officials have given us has been the cause of the loss of that fellow-feeling which formerly existed between the rulers and the ruled. Visionary aspirations have been instilled into our minds and our tongue has become uncontrollable. Sympathy and fellow feeling gone, our words jar upon the ears of our rulers, our prayers are lost upon them and our petitions are forthwith rejected. Our rulers are now of opinion that they know the country well and have become fully acquainted with its people. They take us for half-educated and ease-loving townspeople whose words have no value and are consequently beneath their notice. What the Government thinks it proper to do is sure to be done. Everything is demi-officially settled before the Government, by way of keeping up appearances, invites public opinion. Even a large-hearted and experienced ruler like Mr. Stevens has been compelled to say that in the matter of seditious writings the Government must act according to its conviction, even if that should lead to a difference of opinion between itself and the Press Association. The opinion of educated and experienced editors will be cast to the winds, the conviction of all men of light and leading will go for nothing, and the opinion of those alone will stand and will be enforced who, to speak plainly, do not know the country, are never in touch with its people, are quite innocent of their language and never take the trouble of acquainting themselves with their wants and grievances. Will this vast British Empire, we ask, be shaken to its foundation, if a couple of foolish editors are not sent to jail? Will British prestige receive its death-blow, if a couple of ranting journalists are not transported without a first warning? A subject people as we are, our intellect cannot soar so high as the intellect of the ruling race. Our puny intellect does not and cannot find itself in agreement with the giant intellect of the rulers. Their words, therefore, become often unintelligible to us. It would be sheer impertinence to protest against what we do not even understand, and that is the reason why we do not protest against the policy of our rulers. So, we give the rulers thanks for whatever they say and do.

But let us ask one and only one question. How many humble prayers of the people have you, O English rulers, granted since the Ilbert Bill controversy? Kristodas criticised the Tenancy Bill, section by section, and cried and cried himself to death. But did you hear him? Malaria devastated the Bengal villages and turned them into haunts of wild animals. Rivers and canals silted up and water-scarcity all but killed the people. You poured out 75 crores of rupees on the frontiers, but did you spend even 75 lakhs for the sanitary improvement of Bengal? You played recklessly with the *chaukidari* system, the *patwari* system and the *panchayat* system. You killed out the vitality of the village unions. Did you hear what the zamindars and the



talukdars had to say? You proposed a drainage law and a drainage taxation in the teeth of the public protest. The Consent Act raised a hue and cry all over the country, but did you pay heed to the people's cry? It is the public impression that if a newspaper finds fault with an official, he is sure to be promoted, and that the Government has invariably encouraged and rewarded the public servant who has most incurred the public displeasure. To tell the truth, newspaper editors have become an eye-sore to officialdom and are looked upon with an ungracious eye.

We have, therefore, no other alternative than to preach Hindu principles and rules of life to our readers. We say that, a subject people as we are, it is beyond our province to carry on political agitation; it is sheer impertinence on our part to advise and counsel the Government unasked, and cowardice to go a-begging for political rights and privileges. The Government claims to be all-seeing and all-knowing. It thinks that it can hear all and understand all. If necessary, it will, of its own accord, consult our opinion and seek our advice. If it thinks it just, it will of itself widen the scope of our political rights and privileges. We need not, therefore, cry ourselves hoarse, unasked, in imitation of those beasts who cry in a chorus at nightfall. Our only concern now will be to meekly and resignedly practise religion, strengthen our society, to earn money, to feed our friends and relations, to keep the country's wealth within the country, so far as that is possible. Let the Congress alone. Resist the temptations of Government service. Give up political agitation with all its worry and excitement. Look after your country, your village, your society, your literature, your religion. Keep yourselves at a distance from your rulers, courteously *salaam* them from a distance, pay them taxes and carry out their behest as far as you can. Tell us if this policy is not best calculated to keep matters smooth.

But we are like one between the Devil and the Dead Sea. The educated Babulings will relish nothing in a newspaper except smart and piquant writings as crisp and delicious as *chanachur*, seasoned with salt and pepper and fresh from Ghasiram's bag. To flatter the taste of the reader, to realise subscriptions from him and to keep the Government satisfied—it is impossible to perform all these three tasks at one and the same time. But journalists must live, and most of them are consequently compelled to emulate the conduct of Chhiri Pagli, the proverbial shrew who, when she was worsted in a quarrel, used to draw the likeness of her adversary on the floor, and abuse and kick it at leisure. Sir Edwin Collen called Indian women unchaste from his seat in the Supreme Council. The native papers returned his abuse with more or less fury to please their readers. But Sir Edwin Collen, all unconcerned, sat quietly in his room on the summits of Simla and took a few additional cutlets and a few additional glasses of wine. No one even asked him why he abused Indian women and with what object.

On all these grounds, therefore, we are not satisfied with Mr. Bolton's letter which goes only half way and advocates a hazy and half-hearted policy. We cannot, we dare not follow the advice to Indian journalists which Mr. Stevens had the goodness to give them in 1884. It is sedition to give free vent to one's feelings. It is creating disaffection to ventilate one's grievances. It is meanness to find fault with an official. And yet we are asked to speak out our mind, to advocate the interests of our countrymen even if they are opposed to the interests of our rulers. Rulers as you are, encourage the people, assure them of your forbearance, and they will say everything and say it plainly. But will you, we ask, bear what we shall say? A Lieutenant-Governor may do so; but all officials do not and will not bear our criticism.

It is not, therefore, becoming on the part of a generous, forbearing and just Government to keep us in the dark. Pray let us know the scope of our rights and privileges, and lay down distinctly the line which we must not transgress in our criticism. Let us know what we should write and what we should not write—what we should say and how.

21. The same paper has the following on the Buddh-Gaya temple affair :—

The Buddha-Gaya temple affair. The Hindus revere and worship Buddha-Deva as an incarnation of God. They have faith in his preachings. There is in fact no difference between a Hindu and a true

BANGAVASI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.



Buddhist. Pandit Panchanan Tarkaratna of Bhatpara has proved, in the pages of the *Janmabhumi* from texts culled from Buddhist works, that Buddhadeva observed caste distinctions, was a believer in the *Karmakunda*, had faith in *sraddhs* and *pujas*, and had a desire to protect and maintain the Brahmans. But Buddha-Deva appeared on earth with the mission of enchanting the *Asuras*, and people of *asuric* disposition failed to correctly understand the spirit of his religious principles. Thus arose a religious sect who took religious precepts and principles unowned by Buddha as his own and consequently differed in material points from the Hindus. This sect was, in course of time, swelled by recruits from the lower classes, and as is the case with the Brahmos at present, many members of the higher classes also joined it. The members of this new sect differed from those who looked upon Buddha-Deva as an *avatar*, as an incarnation of God, and held his religious principles to be in consonance with the teachings of the *Vedas*. This is the reason why a new word had to be coined to denote this new sect. Its members were and are even now called Bauddhas or Buddhists.

The Hindus have faith in the worship of an image and believe in the presence of the Godhead in that image. They spend lakhs of rupees on its worship. But not so the Buddhists. To them the image of Buddha is no better than a museum curiosity, not a God, but a device to commemorate the memory of their Lord. There is no doubt a good deal of difference between attachment for a statue commemorating one's memory and reverence for an image of God. Let the Government give the Hindus the same undisputed right of worshipping Buddha's image in Gaya, as they have been given in the matter of the Akshay Bat. Let the Hindus have the right of worshipping the image which is to them a living manifestation of Buddha, and let the Buddhists have only the right of enjoying a sight of the image which is dead and lifeless, so far as they are concerned. The Government ought to see that the worship of the image is not in any way interfered with. If the Japanese image of Buddha is allowed to remain within the precincts of the temple, there may be a material diminution in its income and the peace of the temple may also run the risk of being disturbed. We, therefore, humbly pray the Government to order the removal of the Japanese image of Buddha, and thereby relieve the minds of the Hindu public from anxiety.

SANJIVANI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897

22. The *Sanjivani* of the 30th October writes as follows, with reference to the Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the memorial of the Press Association :—

The Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Press Association. Let newspaper editors now chalk out the line of their duty. Otherwise they will be involved in great difficulty. Some of them have already been taken to task. We agree with Government in its opinion of the position and duty of the native press.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR  
CHANDRIKA,  
Oct. 31st, 1897.

23. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 31st October says that the weekly report on native papers, which is prepared for the Government, is no longer supplied to the newspaper press, but is given only to selected officials. But the *Englishman* gets a copy of it, as is proved by the statement made in it the other day that the translation of an article in the *Bangavasi*, which it had published, was made by Babu Chunder Nath Bose, Bengali Translator to Government. So, the translations from native papers, which are from time to time published in the *Englishman*, are all taken from the official report. It may appear strange to many people that when no outsider, not even the papers concerned, are supplied with the official translations, the *Englishman* alone should be favoured with them. But it should be remembered that the *Englishman* and the *Pioneer* are a part and parcel of the Government. It is true that these newspapers sometimes write against the Government, but that is merely by way of *abdar*. However that may be, what the native papers want is that they too should be allowed to see the official translations. It is not good for the Government to show open partiality to the *Englishman*.

SULABH DAINIK,  
Nov. 1st, 1897.

24. The *Sulabh Dainik* of the 1st November says that though Government is advising an amicable settlement of the Budh-Gaya Temple dispute, it has hitherto taken no steps to accomplish such a settlement. All that it has hitherto done is to send for the Hindu *Mohanta* from time to time and advise him to give up some portion of

The Budh-Gaya affair.



the property in his charge. The quarrel can be easily ended by the Government advising the Buddhists to remove the image of Buddha to some place outside the Hindu pilgrims' rest-house. That it has not ended is only because Government has all this time acted on a different line. Is Government's promise of religious neutrality being fulfilled by practically allowing the Buddhists to establish a new temple near a Hindu temple?

### III.—LEGISLATIVE.

25. The *Sanjivani* of the 30th October thanks the Law Member for two amendments introduced into the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill. The first has reference to the taking of security from persons for good behaviour. The second relates to the punishment of "first offenders." The writer will not be sorry if *badmashes* are severely punished, but he would not grudge even them the lenient treatment which the Government proposes to mete has to them in future. As regards the section relating to "first offenders," it will certainly confer a blessing on the country. If these offenders are, as they now are, sent to jail, they are sure to come out of it hardened in sin. The amendment regarding the cross-examination of witnesses for the prosecution is not, however, unobjectionable. It is to be hoped that Mr. Chalmers will refrain from increasing the rigour of the law relating to the cross-examination of witnesses.

SANJIVANI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.

26. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 31st October says that Sir Henry Prinsep's Bill will make many alterations in the Criminal Procedure Code, and will, on the whole, further curtail the powers of the High Court and increase those of the Magistracy and the Police. Whilst the people are asking for a separation of the judicial and executive functions, in order that the judiciary, in general, and the Deputy Magistrates in particular, may become independent of the executive, the Government is seeking to make the Magistrates more powerful and the Deputy Magistrates more subservient to the Magistrates. The alterations in the Code have been proposed at a time which is very inopportune for the people. But, however alarming the time, a protest must be made.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR  
CHANDRIKA,  
Oct. 31st, 1897.

### VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.

27. The *Chinsura Vartavaha* of the 24th October has the following:—

Tilak as a patriot. We need express no grief for Mr. Gangadhar Tilak, for we feel it as a divine instinct that though the distinguished Mahratta gentleman, in protesting, for the good of his fellow-subjects, against the actions of Government, has been for the present found guilty in the eye of the law, what is now considered to be his offence will at a future time stand out as a conspicuous proof of his patriotism. It is not in the least likely that because Government was the complainant against Mr. Tilak, therefore his political career will come to an end by his present incarceration. Heaven helps the helpless, and we have a firm belief that the Almighty will help the Indians by protecting helpless Tilak!

CHINSURA  
VARTAVAHA  
Oct. 24th, 1897.

Though the Government of India is a real well-wisher of its subjects, it cannot always keep its head steady, and that leads it into mistakes. How are these mistakes to be rectified if there be no protest against official action? It is men like Surendra Nath of Bengal and Gangadhar Tilak of Bombay who are eminently fitted to keep the Government steady in the right path when it appears to be going astray. Does the Bombay Government think that by taking away the liberty of the press and oppressing popular and independent newspaper editors it will always be able to conceal the truth? Lord Sandhurst informed the Secretary of State that no oppression was committed by the plague officers, and that it was only a number of sedition-mongers who conspired against the Government and circulated concocted stories of oppression. But who that carefully watched the *Vaibhav* prosecution can deny that Lord Sandhurst's report was far from being ingenious and straightforward? When a Judge like Mr. Strachey, who has a decided partiality for the Government, admitted that oppressions had actually been committed in the course of the plague inspections, how can one deny that it is no impossibility for the people



to be injured by Government and its officers? We often see that the higher authorities in hiding the wrong-doings of their subordinates, unwillingly commit oppressions upon the people, and not unoften, in hiding their own, call men like Surendra Nath, Narendra Nath, Matilal and Tilak disaffected and disloyal. But the truth is that the most acrimonious protests of the native press never contain sedition. The authorities attempt to stop the mouth of that press simply in order to prevent their own faults and wrong-doings from coming to the notice of the British public.

It is not in anybody's power to suppress truth for ever. Such is the law of nature, that the very acts of Government in depriving the press of its freedom and subjecting the people to oppression are helping the truth to come out. Many people are now saying that the editor of the *Pratod* has been unjustly transported and that Tilak and others were arrested on mere suspicion. It is not wise to disregard what the many say. And it is a question in many people's mouth—What was the *Pratod's* offence? Was it sedition for the editor of that paper to compare India's condition with that of Canada and with a sorrowful heart to exhort his countrymen to improve their condition? Is not Canada British territory? Is not Her Most Gracious Majesty, Empress Victoria, the mother of the Indian people, also adored as a goddess by the Canadians? Are not the Canadian Englishmen as ready as Englishmen at home to shed their blood for Her Majesty's sake? How, then, was it sedition for the *Pratod* to compare India with Canada? Mr. Caine was perfectly right when he said that the authorities should never decide any question of importance in private. Lord Sandhurst, for instance, should not have unjustly punished the spokesmen of the people after making only a secret police enquiry. But then he was more anxious to maintain Government's prestige than to do strict justice.

The authorities will certainly do what they think right and proper. But we, editors, have our duties too. The example of boundless courage set by Tilak will not be lost upon us, and we will, for the sake of the people's good, never refrain from pointing out the faults of the Government. We are actuated by an honest motive, and though the officials consider us as their enemies, we are not so. So long as life lasts we will not fail in our duty. Jesus said:—"Knock, and it shall be opened unto you." If the people of India continually knock at the door of the Government, Jesus' disciples will be obliged to listen to them.

AL PUNCH,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

28. *Al Punch* of the 29th October says that the Government has already suffered a great deal by carrying out its forward policy, and no one knows what is in store for it. If the Amir has really participated in the present risings, he will soon reap the fruit of his own folly. Already his loss has been great, for the thousands of maunds of fruits which were to have come to the Indian market this winter, are rotting at Kabul. The frontier Pathans have been severely punished, and they will never forget the lesson they have been taught for their breach of faith with our Government. But for what fault of ours are we, Indian Musalmans, being charged by the Anglo-Indian Press with disaffection towards the Government? Why is it that, since the Græco-Turkish war, Indian Musalmans have been the main topic of political conversation, and are being suspected of having a political organisation against the Government? The Anglo-Indian Press has written so strongly against the Indian Musalmans, that every movement of a Musalman is watched with suspicion, and the stray firing of a gun leads one to ask if there is a Musalman rising. For our miserable lot, therefore, we must complain neither against the Government nor against its officials, but against the Anglo-Indian Press which has made the Government look upon us with suspicion.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

29. The *Hitavadi* of the 29th October says that as plague has broken out in the neighbourhood of Hardwar, it is the desire of every pious patriot that intending pilgrims should put off their visit to the place till a more suitable opportunity. It is the writer's belief that religious merit acquired by pilgrimage is lessened if it is obtained at the risk of catching contagion in a plague-affected place. Pilgrims will also be subjected to inspection on railways. The editor has been requested by Government to inform the public of the prevalence of the plague.



30. The same paper has to hear no end of absurd rumours. The *Evening News* of England has called Damodar Chapekar an educated Brahman and an Advocate. The *Times* says that Tilak was found guilty by a jury of his own countrymen. It is in such distorted shapes that Indian news are circulated in England. These mistakes may not be wilful, but they are doing Indians much harm.

HITAVADI,  
Oct. 29th, 1897.

31. The *Englishman*, says the same paper, is wrong in concluding from the Magistrate's report on the assault on the manager of a tea-garden at Golaghat that it is because coolies in the tea-gardens earn good wages and are well fed that they have become bold enough to commit assaults upon the managers of their gardens. Even the meanest worm, repeatedly trampled upon, turns round upon the oppressor.

HITAVADI.

32. The same paper says that even the ubiquitous correspondents of the English papers are, it would appear, liable to mistakes. The *Englishman* has published a report about the holding of a seditious meeting at Pratapgar; and the *Times of India* has cut a figure by spreading a false report of the breaking out of a mutiny in certain native regiments. Whatever the fate of a native papers may be, do they ever spread such mischievous rumours as that published by this Bombay paper?

HITAVADI.

33. The same paper writes as follows:—

The *Englishman* a true rebel. The authorities should see whether the *Englishman* is really a rebel or not. In this crisis it has many times sought to increase the discontent of the people by exciting race-feeling. Whenever the tone of the native press becomes somewhat violent, our contemporary calls it sedition. Whenever that press somewhat moderates its tone, it says that, but for castigation, it would not be so moderate and asks its readers to mark how servile the native press has become. We have often seen our contemporary trying to increase ill-feeling and discontent by the use of such strong language and cruel sarcasms. It has now played a very mischievous trick by spreading a false report about the holding of a seditious monster meeting at Pratapgar under the superintendence of two Afghan *mollas*. The Bengal Government felt it necessary to make a careful enquiry into the truth of this serious allegation and not to rely upon the reports of local officers, but found no truth whatever in it and it has informed the public accordingly. The *Englishman* has not, however, yet come round. It maintains that the report of its own correspondent is as credible as that of the informants of Government. Whatever the real fact may be, it must set Europeans against Musalmans at least by creating a suspicion. It says:—

HITAVADI.

"It does not seem to strike the authorities that men were not likely to incriminate themselves. They may be greatly wronged, but we prefer not to emulate the example of the Bengal Government in condemning the correspondent unheard."

Our contemporary may ask its correspondent for an explanation, but it should not have found fault with this enquiry by Government. It is not easy to see how the *Englishman's* report can be true when the Hindu and Musalman residents of Pratapgar unanimously declare that no Afghan *mollas* came there.

We are not aware of our contemporary's object in spreading the report. But it should have known that the report would render Musalmans an object of hatred to the officials, and might lead to oppression upon them. An experienced paper ought not to have published, without careful enquiry, a report which was calculated to increase ill-feeling between Government and the people.

Would a native paper have been easily let off if it had behaved as the *Englishman* has done? Would it not have been threatened with imprisonment for life or for some months on a charge of sedition, creating disaffection, or the like? It is for the authorities to answer these questions. We would, however, ask the *Englishman* to consider how strongly it would have expressed itself and what sarcasm it would have indulged in if a native paper had published some such false report, and whether all native papers are not entitled



to apply similar language to it for its indiscretion. We would say nothing besides this to our contemporary.

It is our firm belief that it is Anglo-Indians of the type of this writer in the *Englishman* who are really enemies of the Government. If those who by their words and conduct destroy all respect for the officials in the minds of the people can be called enemies of the Government, then the *Englishman* and papers like it ought to be prosecuted first for sedition. The attempt of the *Englishman* to break the peace by publishing a false charge against the people and by making repeated endeavours to maintain it requires to be punished first of all. The real rebels are not those papers which point out grievances with a view to their redress, but those which like the *Englishman* create ill-feeling between the conquerors and the conquered, foment quarrels between Hindus and Musalmans and try to trample now upon the former and next upon the latter.

34. The *Sanjivani* of the 30th October has the following:—

SANJIVANI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.

The present condition of India.

There are moments of crisis in the life of a nation as there are in the life of an individual. Indian national life is just now passing through a crisis. Such a crisis has not happened in our national life since the establishment of British rule in India. Famine and plague are carrying away hundreds of lives, while the anger of the Government has thrown the people into a panic. The Government is trying its best to cope with the famine and the plague, but no attempt is being made to extinguish the fire of suspicion and hatred which has been blown into a blaze in the minds of the rulers. Since the introduction of English education into this country, there has been growing up a spirit of rivalry between the rulers and the ruled—a spirit of rivalry which is accompanied, as it must be, by a spirit of jealousy and hatred. Never, however,—not even during the Ilbert Bill controversy—did this spirit of hatred so strikingly manifest itself as it is doing now. During the Ilbert Bill controversy the spirit of hatred was confined among the handful of Europeans residing in this country, but this year it has spread and affected the whole English nation. The English public are no longer so indifferent to questions relating to India as they formerly were. Thanks to the efforts of the British Congress Committee, they now take a lively interest in Indian affairs and the English press devotes a large space to the discussion of Indian topics. But with the growth of English interest in Indian affairs English hatred against the Indian people has increased. Just as a band of sympathetic Members of Parliament have pledged themselves to strive for the improvement of the political status of the Indian people, so another band have made up their mind to foil them in their generous and philanthropic attempt. They are trying their best to excite the hatred of the English people against their Indian fellow subjects by ascribing false motives to the latter and circulating false rumours regarding them. The Indian correspondents of most of the English papers belong to the class of those whose sole object seems to be to do injury to India. The average readers of the English newspapers take the news sent home by them as true and build upon them their opinion of the Indian people. The English papers are not circulated in India, and we are quite ignorant of their contents. We are thus abused and maligned without a protest or a contradiction. The power and influence of the press are very great in England, and it will be to the lasting injury of the Indian people if misrepresentations of their character and conduct are allowed to go on for a long time. To England lies the last appeal of India and it is the firm conviction of the Indian people that the British public are sure to redress their wrongs and grievances if they are properly and correctly reported to them. It has, therefore, become urgently necessary to take steps to prevent the English mind from being poisoned by malicious misrepresentations of the Indian people. The nation which boasts of a Howard, a Clarkson and a Wilberforce is not likely to remain long indifferent to our grievances. But we should keep them acquainted with the true state of things. It will be doing a great good if those who are practised writers of English among us take to the habit of writing on Indian affairs in the English weeklies and monthlies. These writers should expose all fallacies and misrepresentations concerning the Indian people at the same time that they should hold the true aspect of things before the English public. Political



foresightedness, wide experience of India and a facile pen are all that are required in a writer who will have to advocate India's cause in the English papers. Mr. R. C. Dutt has already begun writing in some of the leading English magazines, and others should follow his example. The English public anxiously read whatever is written by eminent Indians on Indian affairs.

In short, we should no longer remain indifferent and supine in this moment of crisis. The time has come when we should, one and all, put forth our whole strength in the defence of our interests. There is everything to be gained and nothing to lose in a just and impartial criticism of the Indian administration. No one is likely to be offended by a statement of historical truth. We should cause a correct idea of India and her people to be presented at every English door. We need not stand as a beggar at the door of any person, but we must publish and promulgate the truth and protest against the circulation of falsehood.

The correspondents of the *Times* and Reuter are no friends of the Indian people, but it is they who keep the English public posted in Indian news upon which English public opinion is based. The English are a busy people. They have no time to read lengthy articles. They derive their information from short telegrams and will not read anything which is old and stale. The Indian correspondents of the *Times* and Reuter are doing great harm to the Indian people. During the Tilak trial the *Times* correspondent circulated the false news that Mr. Tilak had been declared guilty by a majority of native jurors, and led the British public to think that Mr. Tilak was certainly guilty of sedition when he was declared as such by his own peers. Not a moment should be lost in making arrangements for sending correct information to England.

35. The *Englishman*, observes the same paper, has been snubbed for giving publicity to a false rumour to the effect that a seditious Musalman meeting was held at Pratapgar in the Bhagalpore district, in which an Afghan *molla* preached rebellion against the British Government and raised subscriptions for the purpose of making arrangements for the declaration of a *jehad*. The Government, after a careful enquiry into the matter, has come to the conclusion that the rumour was wholly unfounded. The *Englishman* says, in season and out of season, that the vernacular press is in the habit of circulating false rumours and thereby weakening the foundation of British rule in India. The Government will now see that it is the Anglo-Indian press which circulates false rumours and thereby misleads it. Anglo-Indian fault-finding with the vernacular press is thus shown to be utterly unreasonableness.

36. Anglo-Indian writers and officials, says the same paper, are in the habit of accusing Indian of journalists of mendacity and fabrication. The Poona murders and the Calcutta riot have tested the truthfulness of Anglo-Indian writers and shown them in their true colours. Lately Reuter's correspondent in India telegraphed to England that Damodar Chapekar who has been arrested as the perpetrator of the Poona murders is an educated Brahman and an Advocate. Perversion of truth could go no further. An illiterate ruffian has been magnified into an educated Advocate! Who, one is led to ask, is in the habit of circulating falsehood—the native or the Anglo-Indian journalist?

CHUNDER NATH BOSE,

*Bengali Translator.*

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,

*The 6th November 1897.*

SANJIVANI,  
Oct. 30th, 1897.

SANJIVANI.



